

Sinks.Tom@epa.cov [remove]; Jill Jennings-McElheney [remove] **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**
To...

A Challenge to Mr. Tom Sinks EPA Preparation for Trump Executive Orders



ReSinks&EPAonSiF2.docx (156 KB); #@SiF Pubs11-26-16.doc

Attachments... (97 KB); PageProofsCh.22Handbook2.docx (57 KB);
Health&BehaviorF~1.doc (2 MB)

=====

TO: Tom Sinks, EPA and Jill Jennings-McElheney
FROM: Roger Masters, Nelson A Rockefeller Professor Emeritus, Department of
Government, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

The interaction between Jill Jennings-McElheney and Tom Sinks of the EPA raises important scientific issues that have a substantial relevance to the public interest. Mr. Sinks dismisses what he calls "my research" but was actually collaborative research with the late Myron J. Coplan, who was retired Vice President of the Albany Chemical Corp. at the time of his death. In his statement, Mr. Sinks refers to this work in a misleading (and on key points unsubstantiated ways that need to be corrected for the record. In particular, this matters because scientific evidence of harmful effects of the two chemical compounds now used for 90% of water fluoridation in the U.S. is either ignored or dismissed without justification by Mr. Sinks. Since our data documents harmful effects on human behavior that have an estimated cost to American taxpayers of over \$1 Billion a year, I must take the liberty of a long statement supported by the attachments to this email. (Note: the text from this point to the end of my rejoinder to Mr. Sinks is also in the attached file <ReSinks&EPAonSiF2.docx> is that is a preferred document to print out.)

A SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE TO MR. TOM
SINKS

TO: Tom Sinks

cc: other addressees

FROM: Roger D. Masters (Department of Government, Dartmouth College)_

As Tom Sinks has written, our paths crossed some years ago when I was working with the late Myron Coplan (retired Vice President of Albany Chemical Corp.) on the neurotoxicity of fluorosilicic acid (H_2SiF_6) and sodium silicofluoride (Na_2SiF_6). Mr. Sinks describes this interaction in three sentences below, each of which needs to be confronted with factual evidence that follows. (Substantial length is required, since the question concerns a complex scientific issue of great national importance; based on that evidence, this statement ends with my challenge to nationally televised debate:

MR. SINK'S SENTENCE ONE: "When Dr. Masters published a study claiming that a type of fluoride used in finished drinking water was responsible for increased lead in drinking water, I helped decide how to evaluate that work." FACTUAL EVIDENCE: the research was co-authored by a senior industrial chemist who was personally involved (in February 1942) in the original TOP SECRET decision of the Manhattan Project to add fluorosilicic acid to public water supplies. And we didn't publish "a study"; we published a series of seven studies (listed in <SiF_Pubs11-26-16.doc>, a bibliography attached to this email). The Manhattan Project's decision had nothing to do with dental health; the reason was that our only source of uranium for the first A-bomb was phosphate rock. To separate the uranium atoms from other elements, the rock was ground up and immersed in fluorosilicic acid ($\text{pH} = 1$, on the pH measurement of the range usually measured from strongly acidic (zero) to base ($\text{pH} = 14$). The dissociated elements in the acid were put in a centrifuge, throwing the uranium atoms (heaviest atoms) to the outer edge from which it was harvested. Then the Manhattan Project had to separate the liquid acid from the remaining solids, which required a filter that would not be degraded by the strong fluorosilicic acid; in Feb. 1942 Mr. Coplan was the chemist who successfully developed that filter and hence he was directly involved in what was a TOP SECRET plan. After solids were separated from the liquid acid, they could be dumped on any slag pile without a hint of their source. It was necessary to find a secret way to dispose of the remaining fluorosilicic acid. When added to water, sodium fluoride was known to dissociate totally into sodium and fluoride. To test whether adding a fluoride compound to public water supplies would have harmful effects, two similar communities in New York state were chosen: Newburgh and Kingston. Sodium fluoride -- familiar in toothpaste -- was added to the water of Newburgh, while Kingston was used as a "control"; when no adverse effects were observed in Newburgh, it was announced that there had been a successful test of "fluoridating" public water supplies as a dental health measure. While this means of created a "cover" for disposing of fluorosilicic acid was Top Secret, there is indirect evidence of the above history. The CDC published the "FLUORIDATION CENSUS 1992" as an official record of all communities engaged in water fluoridation, with specific indication of the compound used and the date this practice originated. Newburgh, New York is still listed as adding sodium fluoride (NaF) to its water, and the initial date is listed as "5/45" (FLUORIDATION CENSUS, p. 636). The probable reason for this date is that inserting May 1945 as the initial use of sodium fluoride was, by the time the FLUORIDATION CENSUS was published in 1992, obviously no longer necessary to keep secret the fact that the U.S. had developed an

Atomic Bomb. In dating the origin of fluoridating in Newburgh, NY, however, it was advisable to avoid a date after the first A-bomb was dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 and unwise to use the original date. Had the FLUORIDATION CENSUS listed the beginning of this practice as a "test" of safety in 1942, the practice of substituting fluorosilicic acid for sodium fluoride (and giving a historical date and cities for this substitution) would open the use of silicofluorides to demands these compounds be tested for safety. As a result of this history, "water fluoridation" has constantly been discussed (and contested) without reference to the compound used for the purpose: the "cover" planned by the Manhattan Project was all too successful. Because this decision was a Top Secret necessity for developing the first atomic bomb, this story was never published, but I learned of it from Mr. Coplan after he asked me to join him in the study of silicofluoride safety. On retiring, Mr. Coplan realized that the silicofluorides had never been tested for safety after World War II and were now added to the water of millions of Americans. Given the full account of my research on this topic, without evidence of the DATE of the meeting to which Mr. Sinks refers, it is immaterial whether or not he had reason to challenge our data on higher blood lead levels in children exposed to a silicofluoride: over the course of our research we documented a statistically significant association between higher blood lead levels and local water treated with a silicofluoride -- AND we documented statistically significant effects of water treated with a silicofluoride and higher rates of learning dysfunction, more arrests for cocaine use, and higher rates of violent crime, and replicated these findings on different geographic samples.

SECOND SENTENCE BY MR. SINKS that's cited below:

"o I attended a meeting in RTP with Dr. Masters and the NTP folks."

NOTE: Mr. Sinks doesn't give a date for this meeting, and the precise organizations aren't even spelled out. Nor is there any record of what exactly happened at this meeting. Since I don't recall this meeting in sufficient detail to provide evidence concerning a challenge to specific findings in our research, and Mr. Sinks apparently indicates that the only consequence was his decision to do a "follow-up study" (below), this statement is not conclusive on the quality of our evidence of harm.

THIRD SENTENCE OF MR. SINKS' ACCOUNT:

"o I helped design and co-authored a follow-up study we did using NHANES data to test his hypothesis - the findings did not support his hypothesis."

NOTE: there is no reference to a publication or written report presenting these "findings" and making it clear why or how they "did not support his hypothesis." In science, an assertion is not evidence, particularly when confronted with both peer reviewed data and a reasonable hypothesis to explain that data. It was not unreasonable to test a hypothesis based on the prediction that adding a powerful acid to a water supply might well dissolve lead from old lead pipes or lead solder at pipe junctions as well as dissociate lead from copper water meters (all of these processes are consistent with the empirical data in our research).

Of the inaccurate statements made by Mr. Sinks, the most obvious concerns evidence in the PEER REVIEWED studies co-authored by Myron Coplan and myself. A

bibliography of the literature on silicofluoride toxicity, including our seven articles as well as report on our work in Popular Mechanics, is attached (SiF_Pubs11-26-16.doc). While we used the NHANES (National Health and Nutrition Evaluation Survey) database for some of our publications, other data sources were also used.

As evidence of the continued respect for our research findings (see bibliography), which haven't been successfully challenged in peer reviewed scientific publications, also attached are page proofs (PageProofCh22Handboook2.docx) for an article to appear as Chapter 22 in Steven Peterson and Albert Somit, eds., HANDBOOK OF BIOLOGY AND POLITICS (Elgar Press). This volume focuses on a new interdisciplinary field, linking developments in contemporary biology to issues in public policy that can otherwise not be based on sound scientific research. The practice of "water fluoridation" has, for example, generally been attacked without reference to the difference between sodium fluoride (which is widely used in toothpaste and was tested for safety by the Manhattan Project in 1942) and either of the silicofluorides (very strong acids that have still never been fully tested for safety). Our research is therefore challenges both the unscientific practice of criticizing all water fluoridation in terms of supposed dangers of "fluoride," and the practice of defending all water fluoridation on the supposed benefits of "fluoride." On the basis of this research, I have become a widely respected author of scientific studies of harmful effects of toxic chemicals. For example, my publications since 2001 as listed in the attached bibliography show many peer reviewed studies of harmful effects of toxins on the brain and human behavior. For example, it's not irrelevant to my challenge to Mr. Sinks that my publications include two peer reviewed articles in Neurotoxicology, which is often considered one of the most important journals in this field.

Since most addressees of this email, and especially Mr. Tom Sinks, will doubtless not have time to consider all the evidence that's described above, another file (#@Toxins, Health&BehaviorFinal1-4-3a.docx) is attached because it provides a one page summary of our work, followed by 17 pages of graphs and tables with data. In this file, it is sufficient to look at Figure 1, which provides evidence of the "% of local communities with children over 10µg/dL of blood lead" in 4 different groups of Massachusetts cities and towns: "Self SiF" (communities with local water fluoridation using one of the silicofluorides), "MWR SiF" (the large Metropolitan Water Resource district that provides water treated with silicofluorides to multiple communities in Greater Boston), "NaF" (communities fluoridating water with sodium fluoride), and "None" (communities that do not fluoridate their water). This graph shows vividly the substantial difference between the frequency of children with high blood lead levels in both categories of communities using silicofluorides when compared with either communities using sodium fluoride as chemicals for water fluoridation or not fluoridating at all.

TO CONCLUDE: I HEREBY CHALLENGE MR. TOM SINKS TO A NATIONALLY TELEVISED DEBATE ON THE TOPIC: "Resolved: Current scientific evidence indicates water fluoridation with either Fluorosilicic Acid or Sodium Silicofluoride has harmful effects not observed where Sodium Fluoride is added to a public water supply."

Roger.D.Masters, Nelson A. Rockefeller Professor Emeritus, Department of Government, 3 Lyme Rd., Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2017 3:34 PM
To: Sinks, Tom
Cc: Wendy Cleland-Hamnett; Stan Barone; pruit.scott@epa.gov; Steven Neugeboren; Carrie Wehling; Dawn Messier; Stephanie Flaharty; grevatt.peter@epa.go; Eric Burneson; Phil Oshida; Crystal Rodgers-Jenkins; Ruth Etzel; Matthew Tejada; Francesca Grifo; William Dent; <Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>; Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov; <Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>; Keri Gardner; Joshua Findlay; caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov; Megan Whittemore; <mtiemann@crs.loc.gov>; Alan Larsen; Arthur Elkins; Velveta Golightly-Howell
Subject: Re: ***URGENT*** - EPA Preparation for Trump Executive Orders

Thanks for the clarification, Dr. Sinks. Given your ideal position, did you read the TSCA petition? Did anyone acting on behalf of the Science Advisor read it? Did anyone in your office assist in crafting the rejection response? The reason I am asking is because a science expert read the EPA response signed by Wendy, and it is problematic.

Did you let Wendy/Stan know that you served as a HHS panel water fluoridation member and had this fluoridation background @ CDC? The NTP scientific teleconference update was held on FEB 16th with the public. Was it considered in any way before this TSCA rejection was signed on FEB 17 by Wendy? Wendy thinks it is important to address industry and lawyers, but she did not give equal time to victims. Has Administrator Pruitt provided a mechanism for envirovictims in his deregulation strategy?

Can you provide me with those CDC/NTP meeting files you referenced with Dr. Masters? I have communicated with Dr. Masters on his research on numerous occasions so I am BCC him here to get his opinion of the meeting if he wishes to respond. I am BCC other representatives as well who submitted the TSCA petition to inform them.

Since Wendy/TSCA & the Office of Water failed to meet with me as an envirovictim after repeated requests, and before Wendy signed off on their published TSCA rejection, we have a situation. Victims of neurotoxicity were denied proper representation then exploited as non existing in the TSCA rejection response.

What would everyone @ EPA propose we do at this time?

Thank you,

Jill

On Feb 27, 2017, at 1:41 PM, Sinks, Tom
<Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>> wrote:

Jill - my involvement is summarized below:

- The Division of Oral Health would occasionally ask my advice when they were asked about toxicity issues.
- When Dr. Masters published a study claiming that a type of fluoride used in finished drinking water was responsible for increased lead in drinking water, I helped decide how to evaluate that work.
- o I attended a meeting in RTP with Dr. Masters and the NTP folks.
- o I helped design and co-authored a follow-up study we did using NHANES data to test his hypothesis - the findings did not support his hypothesis.
- As you know, I was asked by CDC and HHS to be involved in the HHS panel to consider revisions in the optimal level of fluoride in drinking water.

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney [mailto:**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**]
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Sinks, Tom <Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>>
Subject: Re: ***URGENT*** - EPA Preparation for Trump Executive Orders

Hi Dr. Sinks,

Writing now to clarify what work you did at CDC involving water fluoridation? Any word at this time on interviewing taking place for Science Adviser?

Thanks,

Jill

On Feb 17, 2017, at 4:37 PM, Sinks, Tom
<Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>> wrote:
Jill – my office does not coordinate meetings for issues managed by the Program offices. You already have requested meetings directly with them. I did let them know that I would attend their meetings if they hold them and if they invite me.

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney [mailto:**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2017 4:14 PM

To: McCabe, Catherine
<McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov<mailto:McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>>
Cc: Wehling, Carrie <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>;
Neugeboren, Steven
<Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>; Messier, Dawn
<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>; Flaharty, Stephanie
<Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>; Grevatt, Peter
<Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov<mailto:Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>>; Oshida, Phil
<Oshida.Phil@epa.gov<mailto:Oshida.Phil@epa.gov>>; Burneson, Eric
<Burneson.Eric@epa.gov<mailto:Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>>; Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal
<Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>;
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov<mailto:Barone.Stan@epa.gov>>; Cleland-
Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov<mailto:Cleland-
Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>>; Sinks, Tom
<Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>>; Etzel, Ruth
<Etzel.Ruth@epa.gov<mailto:Etzel.Ruth@epa.gov>>; Tejada, Matthew
<Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov<mailto:Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov>>; Grifo, Francesca
<Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov<mailto:Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov>>; William Dent
<William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov>>;
<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>
<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>;
Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov>;
caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov>;
Megan Whittemore
<Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov>>;
<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>
<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>; Joshua
Findlay <joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov<mailto:joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov>>;
Keri Gardner <Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov<mailto:Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov>>;
Golightly-Howell, Velveta <Golightly-Howell.Velveta@epa.gov<mailto:Golightly-
Howell.Velveta@epa.gov>>; Lapierre, Kenneth
<Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov<mailto:Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>>; Larsen, Alan
<Larsen.Alan@epa.gov<mailto:Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>>; Elkins, Arthur
<Elkins.Arthur@epa.gov<mailto:Elkins.Arthur@epa.gov>>; Gerson Gomez
<ggomez@usccr.gov<mailto:ggomez@usccr.gov>>; Lenore Ostrowsky
<lostrowsky@usccr.gov<mailto:lostrowsky@usccr.gov>>
Subject: Fwd: ***URGENT*** - EPA Preparation for Trump Executive Orders

Ms. McCabe,

With the confirmation of Scott Pruitt in the post of Administrator now, please brief him of my concerns to you.

This is an important matter involving his beloved oil and gas industry.

Scientists and water poisoned victims met with The National Toxicology Program

yesterday regarding fluoride. I am still requesting Dr. Sinks call a meeting with Stan/Wendy and The Office of Water based upon that meeting.

Thank you,

Jill Jennings-McElheney

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney

<micaahsmission@aol.com> **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** >>

Date: February 16, 2017 at 12:37:48 PM EST

To: "mccabe.catherine@epa.gov<mailto:mccabe.catherine@epa.gov>"

<mccabe.catherine@epa.gov<mailto:mccabe.catherine@epa.gov>>

Cc: Carrie Wehling <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>,

Steven Neugeboren

<neugeboren.steven@epa.gov<mailto:neugeboren.steven@epa.gov>>, Dawn Messier

<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>, Stephanie Flaharty

<Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>,

"grevatt.peter@epa.gov<mailto:grevatt.peter@epa.gov>"

<grevatt.peter@epa.gov<mailto:grevatt.peter@epa.gov>>, Phil Oshida

<Oshida.Phil@epa.gov<mailto:Oshida.Phil@epa.gov>>, Eric Burneson

<burneson.eric@epa.gov<mailto:burneson.eric@epa.gov>>, Crystal Rodgers-Jenkins

<Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>, Stan

Barone <Barone.Stan@epa.gov<mailto:Barone.Stan@epa.gov>>, Wendy Cleland-

Hamnett <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov<mailto:Cleland-

Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>>, Tom Sinks

<Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>>, Ruth Etzel

<etzel.ruth@epa.gov<mailto:etzel.ruth@epa.gov>>, Matthew Tejada

<Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov<mailto:Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov>>, Francesca Grifo

<Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov<mailto:Grifo.Francesca@epa.gov>>, William Dent

<William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov>>,"

<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>"

<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>,"

"Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov>"

<Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov>>,"

"caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov>"

<caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov>>,"

Megan Whittemore

<Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov>>,"

<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>"

<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>, Joshua

Findlay <joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov<mailto:joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov>>,"

Keri Gardner <Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov<mailto:Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov>>,"

Velveta Golightly-Howell <Golightly-Howell.Velveta@epa.gov<mailto:Golightly-

Howell.Velveta@epa.gov>>, Kenneth Lapierre
<Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov<mailto:Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>>, Alan Larsen
<Larsen.Alan@epa.gov<mailto:Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>>, Arthur Elkins
<elkins.arthur@epa.gov<mailto:elkins.arthur@epa.gov>>, Gerson Gomez
<ggomez@usccr.gov<mailto:ggomez@usccr.gov>>, Lenore Ostrowsky
<lostrowsky@usccr.gov<mailto:lostrowsky@usccr.gov>>
Subject: ***URGENT*** - EPA Preparation for Trump Executive Orders
Dear Acting Administrator McCabe:

Given today's important news below from Reuters, please advise after reviewing my follow up to you on the co-opting of the justice system as it relates to EPA's role. As a former DOJ and enforcement attorney, I appeal to you to brief the current administration on what I have brought to your attention.

Regardless of any executive orders that have and will be directed to EPA by the new administration, there is current extensive systemic abuse and fraud of the environmental regulatory system. This has resulted in the illegal withholding of regulatory protection to vulnerable subpopulations.

Envirovictims of the U.S. who have not been removed from harm's way of environmental hazards are being illegally stripped of their regulatory protection due to:

1. internal agency chaos, retaliation, and abuse of authority
2. unethical rank and file decision making that abdicates legal removal from environmental hazards to default institutional and illegal racism & discrimination
3. a hijacked justice system that improperly shields and does not pursue environmental crimes denying representation and disclosure to envirovictims
4. Exclusive dispute resolution to perpetrators through ineffective fines, supplemental environmental projects, and extensively delayed and/or no remediation
5. Withholding legitimate and critical information that impedes and/or generates fraudulent state and local investigations for envirovictims

Envirovictims also suffer from exploitation and disparate impact of antiquated toxicology that EPA promotes from invasive political interference and third party profiteer meddling.

It is important that you inform the new administration that you have been informed by envirovictims that the justice system has been co-opted to intentionally exclude envirovictims from being properly notified, represented, and provided relevant evidence of environmental crimes. Not only has the press uncovered wide spread agency malfeasance across the country triggered by Flint's catastrophic water poisoning, but research by criminal justice experts has also concluded the Justice Department has not

aggressively pursued or punished environmental crimes.

EPA staff told to prepare for Trump executive orders:

Sources.<<http://newsletters.environmentalhealthnews.org/t/255205/2086/194295/0/>>

Staff at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency have been told that President Donald Trump is preparing a handful of executive orders to reshape the agency.

Reuters<<http://newsletters.environmentalhealthnews.org/t/255205/2086/194295/0/>>.

I ask for immediate attention to this serious matter, and look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jill Jennings-McElheney

Envirovictim of EPA Region IV

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney

<[REDACTED] Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy [REDACTED]>>

Date: February 15, 2017 at 1:11:25 PM EST

To: "Oshida, Phil" <Oshida.Phil@epa.gov<mailto:Oshida.Phil@epa.gov>>

Cc: "Neugeboren, Steven"

<Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>, "Messier,

Dawn" <Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>, "Grevatt, Peter"

<Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov<mailto:Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>>, "Burneson, Eric"

<Burneson.Eric@epa.gov<mailto:Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>>, "Rodgers-Jenkins,

Crystal" <Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-

Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>, "Flaharty, Stephanie"

<Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>, "Wehling,

Carrie" <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>, "

"mccabe.catherine@epa.gov<mailto:mccabe.catherine@epa.gov>"

<mccabe.catherine@epa.gov<mailto:mccabe.catherine@epa.gov>>, Tom Sinks

<Sinks.Tom@epa.gov<mailto:Sinks.Tom@epa.gov>>, William Dent

<William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:William_Dent@isakson.senate.gov>>,
"<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>"
<Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Amy_Turner@isakson.senate.gov>>,
Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov<mailto:Betsy_Dietz@isakson.senate.gov>,
"caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov>"
<caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:caroline_vanvick@perdue.senate.gov>>,
Megan Whittemore
<Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov<mailto:Megan_Whittemore@perdue.senate.gov>>,"<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>"
<Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov<mailto:Rep.JodyHice@mail.house.gov>>," Keri
Gardner <Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov<mailto:Keri.Gardner@mail.house.gov>>,
Joshua Findlay
<joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov<mailto:joshua.findlay@mail.house.gov>>
Subject: Re: 6-Year Review and fluoride -- RE: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation
Hello Phil,

Hope 2017 is off to a good start for you. I am aware of the opportunity for citizens to comment on the 6 Year Review. I was notified back in January from an envirovictim of water fluoridation of this.

My outreach to request a meeting with EPA is actually based on the new administration's science and dismantling agenda of the EPA by March 2018. Before EPA enforcement is closed and states assume that authority, we need to clarify some information.

I had asked Dr. Tom Sinks to moderate a meeting between your office and with Stan and Wendy since Dr. Sinks has had a long time science presence at the CDC and now heads up the EPA Office of the Science Advisor.

The deadline is looming on the EPA TSCA petition:

<http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/epa-petition.pdf>

<http://fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/TSCA-Presentation.pptx>

If you have checked your email from earlier today, you will see you were copied as a follow up to the 2015 meeting you were nominated to attend by Carrie. We are holding a teleconference tomorrow with NTP as a follow up on the 2016 meeting which Crystal attended.

Please let me know if you would feel more comfortable with the legal advisers attending our meeting at this time. These meetings are documented as equal access to envirovictims in harm's way of water fluoridation.

Thanks,

Jill

On Feb 14, 2017, at 4:41 PM, Oshida, Phil
<Oshida.Phil@epa.gov<mailto:Oshida.Phil@epa.gov>> wrote:
February 14, 2017

Jill,

My colleagues in EPA's Office of General Counsel informed me that you requested a meeting. I assume that a meeting at this time with the Office of Water would focus on the results of our Review of Existing Drinking Water Standards and Request for Public Comment<<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/11/2016-31262/national-primary-drinking-water-regulations-announcement-of-the-results-of-epas-review-of-existing>> and/or Information on Related Issues, which was published in the Federal Register on January 11, 2017. As you know, we have completed a detailed review of 76 existing national primary drinking water regulations. The fluoride regulation was among those reviewed. Eight of the reviewed regulations are candidates for regulatory revision. Fluoride is not among the candidates for revision.

Rather than a meeting, we prefer that you provide your comments on the results of this 6-year review of existing regulations through our docket (public comments are being accepted through March 13, 2017). EPA has invited commenters to submit relevant data or information pertaining to the national primary drinking water regulations identified in this action as candidates for revision, as well as other relevant information. If you have information from peer reviewed science and supporting studies relative to the fluoride regulation and/or other regulations reviewed in this action that will help inform future scientific analyses, please feel encouraged to submit that information to the docket.

Please submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OW-2016-0627, to the Federal eRulemaking Portal: <http://www.regulations.gov>.

Thank you.

-Phil-

Phil Oshida S Deputy Director S Standards and Risk Management Division S Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water S Office of Water S U.S. EPA S 202.564.6594

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney [mailto:**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**]
Sent: Friday, February 10, 2017 2:04 PM
To: Wehling, Carrie <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>
Cc: Neugeboren, Steven

<Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>; Messier, Dawn
<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>; Grevatt, Peter
<Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov<mailto:Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>>; Burneson, Eric
<Burneson.Eric@epa.gov<mailto:Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>>; Oshida, Phil
<Oshida.Phil@epa.gov<mailto:Oshida.Phil@epa.gov>>; Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal
<Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>;
Flaharty, Stephanie
<Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>
Subject: Re: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation

Hello Carrie,

The Office of the Science Advisor should be contacting you and Steven to set up a meeting.

A situation has arisen at EPA Region 5 this week (Flint region) that could be damaging to the Trump administration's agenda based on the Make EPA Great Again hearing. Would like to speak with you before taking it to Ms. McCabe.

As I have previously stated, this requested meeting involves infrastructural costs, NEPA, and TSCA compliance of water fluoridation. Steven's legal statement in 2016 will be on the agenda as well.

We feel the Office of the Science Advisor can facilitate such a meeting given the new administration's agenda for EPA and science.

Thanks,

Jill

On Feb 7, 2017, at 3:26 PM, Wehling, Carrie

<Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>> wrote:

Jill, I understand you are requesting a meeting but not sure I understand what it would be about.

Thanks.

Carrie

Caroline (Carrie) Wehling
Assistant General Counsel
Water Law Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington DC 20004
202-564-5492
wehling.carrie@epa.gov<mailto:wehling.carrie@epa.gov>

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney [mailto:**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**]
Sent: Tuesday, February 07, 2017 2:06 PM
To: Wehling, Carrie <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>
Cc: Neugeboren, Steven
<Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>; Messier, Dawn
<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>
Subject: Fwd: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation

Carrie,

Dawn says you are filling in for her.

Please advise.

Thanks,

Jill

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney
<**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**>>
Date: February 7, 2017 at 1:39:03 PM EST
To: "Messier, Dawn" <Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>>
Cc: "Wehling, Carrie" <Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>, "Neugeboren, Steven" <Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>, "Taylor, Dawn" <Taylor.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Taylor.Dawn@epa.gov>>, "Flaharty, Stephanie" <Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>, "Burneson, Eric" <Burneson.Eric@epa.gov<mailto:Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>>, "Grevatt, Peter" <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov<mailto:Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>>, "Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal" <Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>
Subject: Re: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation
Dear Dawn,

Passing along the link to the hearing today, Make EPA Great Again:

<https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=v7krqZxXu94>

Please advise on our meeting.

Thanks,

Jill

On Feb 6, 2017, at 2:17 PM, Messier, Dawn
<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>> wrote:

Hi Jill. I suggest you contact OPP directly for any information concerning their meeting.

Regarding Steve, his e-mail absence greeting was incorrect.

Thanks. Dawn

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney
<micahsmission@aol.com<Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>>
Sent: Friday, February 3, 2017 9:27 AM
To: Messier, Dawn
Cc: Wehling, Carrie; Neugeboren, Steven; Taylor, Dawn; Flaharty, Stephanie; Burneson, Eric; Grevatt, Peter; Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal
Subject: Re: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation

Thanks, Dawn. Please speak to the attorney in attendance from the Office of General Counsel & get back to me about a time we can all meet.

Jill

On Feb 3, 2017, at 9:19 AM, Messier, Dawn
<Messier.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Messier.Dawn@epa.gov>> wrote:

Jill -- I'm responding for Steve and Carrie. We have not spoken to OPP about a Monday meeting. Dawn

Dawn Messier

USEPA

Office of General Counsel

Water Law Office

(202)564-5517

From: Jill Jennings-McElheney
<micahsmission@aol.com<mailto:**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**>>
Sent: Thursday, February 2, 2017 12:40 PM
To: Wehling, Carrie
Cc: Neugeboren, Steven; Taylor, Dawn; Flaharty, Stephanie; Burneson, Eric; Grevatt, Peter; Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal; Messier, Dawn
Subject: Re: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation

Thanks, Carrie. I'm concerned with press reports I'm reading about strategy to total dismantle EPA by March 2018. I would like to know if you or Steven or anyone @ Water Law Office has spoken to Office of Pollution Prevention about a meeting that took place Monday? Please let me know if we can discuss.

Thanks,

Jill

> On Feb 2, 2017, at 8:43 AM, Wehling, Carrie
<Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>> wrote:
>
> Hi, Jill. We have not had any opportunity to discuss this issue with the incoming Administration. We do not yet have a confirmed Administrator. Even when we have a confirmed Administrator, it will be a little while before (s)he has staff in place and is ready for discussions of this kind. Normally takes a few months.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Carrie

>
> Caroline (Carrie) Wehling
> Assistant General Counsel
> Water Law Office
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
> Washington DC 20004
> 202-564-5492
> wehling.carrie@epa.gov<mailto:wehling.carrie@epa.gov>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Jill Jennings-McElheney [mailto:] **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**
> Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2017 1:00 AM
> To: Neugeboren, Steven
<Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov<mailto:Neugeboren.Steven@epa.gov>>; Wehling, Carrie
<Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov<mailto:Wehling.Carrie@epa.gov>>
> Cc: Taylor, Dawn <Taylor.Dawn@epa.gov<mailto:Taylor.Dawn@epa.gov>>;
Flaharty, Stephanie
<Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov<mailto:Flaharty.Stephanie@epa.gov>>; Burneson, Eric
<Burneson.Eric@epa.gov<mailto:Burneson.Eric@epa.gov>>; Grevatt, Peter
<Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov<mailto:Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>>; Rodgers-Jenkins, Crystal
<Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov<mailto:Rodgers-Jenkins.Crystal@epa.gov>>
> Subject: 2017 Agenda for Water Fluoridation
>
> Hello Steven:
>
> I am writing to you & Carrie as the new administration has now transitioned to power.
>
> I would like to ask you since the JAN 11, 2017 post in the FR regarding the 6 year
review, does EPA Office of Water maintain the same legal position as you did with the
Obama Administration?
>
> Thank you,
>
> Jill
>
>